

Application Serial No. 10/719,101 Response dated August 23, 2004 Reply to Office Action dated July 21, 2004

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of	)	
James W. Skinner	)	Group: 3676
Serial No.: 10/719,101	)	•
Filed: November 21, 2003	)	Examiner:
Title: PIPE JOINT SEAL WITH CLOSED	)	
END FACE	)	
	-	

## **ELECTION**

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Responsive to the Restriction Requirement set forth by the Examiner in the Office Action dated July 21, 2004, Applicant hereby elects to prosecute the invention of Group I, Claims 1-27, in the present patent application. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to file one or more divisional patent applications with claims directed toward the invention of Group II, Claims 28-34.

Responsive to the Examiner's Election Requirement, Applicant hereby elects, with traverse, Species I, Figs. 1-2 and 6. Currently, Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-15, and 17-21 are readable upon Species I.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's Election Requirement, which sets forth six different species, is improper in view of the disclosure of the present patent application. The present patent application discloses a first gasket, shown in Figs. 1-6, and a second gasket, shown in Figs. 7-11. As discussed in detail in the specification, the second gasket of Figs. 7-11 differs from the first gasket of Figs. 1-6 in that the second gasket includes an auxiliary sealing portion 84 to allow the gasket to provide a stab-joint type seal with a pipe without folding sealing portion 38 of the gasket inwardly, as shown in Fig. 11. In fact, Applicant has used the same reference numerals to designate identical features of the first and second gaskets in the specification and in Figs. 1-11. In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the Election Requirement.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to consider additional claims which are written in independent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim under 37 C.F.R. 1.141 should a generic claim be held allowable. For example,

Application Serial No. 10/719,101 Response dated August 23, 2004 Reply to Office Action dated July 21, 2004

independent Claim 1 currently reads on both the first gasket shown in Figs. 1-6 and the second gasket shown in Figs. 7-11, with dependent Claim 10 depending therefrom and calling for the additional feature of the auxiliary sealing portion 84 of the second gasket.

It is believed that the above represents a complete response to the Official Action and reconsideration is requested. In the event Applicant has overlooked the need for an additional extension of time, payment of fee, or additional payment of fee, Applicant hereby petitions therefore and authorizes that any charges be made to Deposit Account No. 02-0385, Baker & Daniels.

Should the Examiner have any further questions regarding the foregoing, he is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned at (260) 424-8000.

Respectfully submitted,

Adam F. Cox

Registration No. 46,644

Attorney for Applicants

AFC/mt

BAKER & DANIELS 111 East Wayne Street, Suite 800 Fort Wayne, IN 46802 Telephone: 260-424-8000

Facsimile: 260-460-1700

Enc. Return Postcard

**CERTIFICATION OF MAILING** 

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on: August 23, 2004

ADAM F. COX, REG. NO. 46,644

Name of Registered Representative

Signature

August 23, 2004

Date